

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 48-50, 54, 59, 61 and 63 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,671,745 (*Mathur et al.*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,971,851 (*Pascal et al.*). In addition, the Examiner has rejected claims 51, 52 and 62 as being unpatentable over *Mathur, pascal* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,727,544 (*Brunner et al.*). Claims 55-57 and 60 have been rejected as being unpatentable over *Mathur, pascal* and further in view of Official Notice. Claim 58 has been rejected as being unpatentable over *Mathur, pascal*, the Official Notice and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,944,821 (*Angelo*). The Examiner's rejection of claims is fully traversed below for the following reasons:

a) It is respectfully submitted that *Mathur et al.* does not teach or suggest a system handler application operable to dynamically link with a plurality of gaming program shared objects and device handlers and load the gaming program shared objects and device handlers. It should be noted that the gaming program shared objects can be effectively shared between two or more computerized wagering games.

b) Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that *Mathur et al.* does not teach or suggest a system handler application comprising functions callable by and used by the program shared objects.

c) Still further, it is respectfully submitted that *Mathur et al.* does not teach or suggest a system handler application operable to initiate execution of a computerized wagering game and write data variables to at least one of the operating state storage and non-volatile storage.

d) In addition, it is respectfully submitted that *Mathur et al.* does not teach or suggest a device handler accessing a look-up table for data variables.

e) Finally, it is respectfully submitted that *Mathur et al.* does not teach or suggest changing the data variables to cause execution of a corresponding callback function of the program shared objects.

Claim 1 recites these features and is therefore patentable over *Mathur et al.*

Independent claim 61 recites one or more other features noted above and is therefore patentable over *Mathur et al.*

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed because the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner.

Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. IGT1P369D1). Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/RMahboubian/
Ramin Mahboubian
Reg. No. 44,890

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(408) 255-8001